UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,539	07/06/2001	David S. Ebbo	40062.0265US01	3399

27488 7590 07/30/2007

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
AILES, BENJAMIN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/899,539	EBBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin A. Ailes	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 13 June 2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 14-18 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann et al. (US 7,171,443 B2), hereinafter referred to as Tiemann, in view of Tso et al. (US 6,892,226 B1), hereinafter referred to as Tso.

5. Regarding claims 1, 14 and 27, Tiemann teaches a method for providing a response to a request for information from a client computing system comprising receiving, at the server computing system, a request for information from the client computing system (col. 2, ll. 26-28), creating a page object having references to objects (col. 6, ll. 1-10; use of a template). Tiemann teaches the identification of data objects

("determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; determining whether each user control supports output caching; determining whether the object referenced by the page object is cached if the object corresponds to a user control that supports output caching") and retrieving the output data of the object referenced by the page object and retrieving executable code for objects (col. 6, ll. 1-10, Tiemann teaches the identification of dynamic and static portions; col. 7, ll. 9-15, use of JavaScript) wherein certain objects are identified as cached objects (col. 6, ll. 6-10). Tiemann teaches the use of a cache that is locally accessible by a user (col. 4, ll. 25-27) however does not teach of a cache that is located at the server. However, in related art, Tso teaches similarly to Tiemann the request by a client being sent to a server for information (col. 3, ll. 14-19) and Tso teaches further the utilization of retrieving content located at the server and storing and retrieving the content in and from a server-side cache memory (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 11). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention would have recognized the use of a server side cache memory and therefore would have found it obvious in combination with Tiemann to utilize a cache memory as taught by Tso. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a server-side cache memory as taught by Tso wherein Tso teaches that it is advantageous to utilize a cache memory when needing to retrieve content for a user and have versions of content for later use without the need to re-retrieve content from a network source (Tso, col. 5, ll. 8-11).

Tiemann teaches further the inserting any retrieved output data and any created objects as components into a hierarchical tree data model at the server computing

system (col. 6, ll. 1-37, use of template file and example template file), processing the components of the hierarchical tree data model at the server computing system to create a renderable page object (col. 7, ll. 4-11, after portions of the template have been identified the HTML file is generated); and sending the renderable page object from the server computing system to the client computing system (col. 2, ll. 32-37).

6. Regarding claims 2 and 15, Tiemann and Tso teach wherein:

the user control includes an output caching directive providing instructions for caching output data generated by processing the user control (Tso, col. 6, ll. 14-16; Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 39-44, use of a CACHE tag),

processing the components further comprises:

storing the output data in the output cache (Tso, col. 6, ll. 16-20).

7. Regarding claims 3 and 16, Tiemann and Tso teach the method wherein the contents of the renderable page comprises an HTML specification for a web page (Tiemann, col. 7, ll. 4-9).

8. Regarding claim 4, Tiemann and Tso teach the method wherein:

the renderable page includes at least one user control (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 4-9, static and dynamic portions are determined);

the step of inserting includes inserting a component corresponding to each respective one of the at least one user control (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 1-37, use of template file and example template file).

9. Regarding claims 5 and 18, Tiemann and Tso teach the method further comprising:

creating the hierarchical tree data model including each of the components and a hierarchical relationship among the components, the data model being used during the step of processing the page to facilitate processing each of the components (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 1-37, use of template file and example template file).

10. Regarding claim 17, Tiemann and Tso teach the method wherein:

the renderable page includes at least one control (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 4-9, static and dynamic portions are determined);

the step of inserting a component includes inserting a component corresponding to each respective one of the at least one control (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 1-37, use of template file and example template file); and

the step of processing the created objects comprises processing each one of the components individually (Tiemann, col. 6, ll. 51-57).

11. Claims 6-9 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann and Tso in view of Schloss et al. (US 6,249,844 B1), hereinafter referred to as Schloss.

12. Regarding claims 6 and 19, Tiemann and Tso teach the utilization of a cache as outlined above but do not explicitly recite wherein the output caching directive includes a time duration during which the output data is permitted to reside in the output cache. However, in related art, Schloss teaches on this method wherein Schloss teaches the utilization of standard cache management policies including duration (6, ll. 46-51). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize caching rules like the ones described by Schloss in combination with

the invention as taught by Tiemann and Tso. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize standard cache management policies as is known in the art to maximize the efficiency of the cache.

13. Regarding claims 7 and 20, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the method wherein the output caching directive includes an attribute indicating a condition for varying the output data to be stored in the output cache (Schloss, col. 6, ll. 46-51).

14. Regarding claims 8 and 21, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the method wherein the attribute indicates that the output data is to be stored in the output cache according to a type of browser used by the client computing system (Tso, col. 6, ll. 11-14).

15. Regarding claims 9 and 22, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the method wherein the attribute indicates that the output data is to be stored in the output cache according to values of at least one parameter (Schloss, col. 6, ll. 46-51).

16. Claims 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann, Tso and Schloss in view of Mattson (U.S. Patent Number 5,434,992), hereinafter referred to as Mattson.

17. Regarding claims 10 and 23, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the need to increase data output performance, but are silent on the use of performance counters to monitor output-caching performance. However, Mattson teaches the use of counters to measure the performance of a cache (col. 9, line 56 – col. 10, line 2). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have recognized the advantage of using performance counters in order to improve the output of data

(Schloss, col. 2, lines 27-30). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the performance counters disclosed by Mattson with the data output method using data caching disclosed by Schloss.

18. Regarding claims 11 and 24, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the need to increase data output performance, but are silent on the use of hit and miss counters to monitor output-caching performance. However, Mattson teaches the uses of hit and miss counters to measure the performance of a cache (col. 9, lines 56-64). The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claims 10 and 23 applies equally as well to claims 11 and 24.

19. Regarding claims 13 and 26, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the need to increase data output performance, but is silent on the use of calculating an output cache hit ratio to monitor output-caching performance. However, Mattson teaches the use of calculating hit ratios in order to measure the performance of a cache (col. 9, lines 56-64). The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claims 10 and 23 applies equally as well to claims 13 and 26.

20. Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann, Tso and Schloss in view of Smith et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,600), hereinafter referred to as Smith.

21. Regarding claims 12 and 25, Tiemann, Tso and Schloss teach the need to increase data output performance, but are silent on counting the number of additions and removals to the output cache. However, Smith taught gathering statistics based on

directory entries to measure output-caching performance (col. 5, lines 8-54). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have recognized the advantage of using performance counters in order to improve the output of data (Schloss, col. 2, lines 27-30). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the statistics gathering method disclosed by Smith with the data output method using data caching disclosed by Schloss.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments filed 13 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 1

23. Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that the combination of Tiemann and Tso fails to disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control and furthermore that none of the cited references discloses determining whether each user control supports output caching. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The interpretation of a "user control" is given its broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification of the applicant. A "user control" is being interpreted any type of data object which controls or manipulates how data is displayed to a user on for example a web page which is viewed using a web browser using for example appropriate tags (i.e. HTML tags). Tso and Tiemann both teach on this aspect. Tiemann teaches the retrieval of data objects (static and dynamic portions of a web page) in column 6, lines 1-10 wherein the data objects are indicated

by an identifier. Cacheable portions are indicated using an identifier. In a non-limiting example, Tiemann teaches in column 6, lines 5-10 the use of a tag (CACHE@) which indicates that portion or data object being a cacheable portion or data object. Therefore, at least Tiemann teaches on the use of user controls and the determining whether each user control supports output caching. In view of the cited references, independent claim 1 is not deemed patentable. Independent claims 14 and 27 recite similar subject matter and are not deemed patentable for the same rationale set forth with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

Andrew Caldwell

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER